

REMARKS

Rejections under 35 USC §102(a)

Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Furuya et al. (JP 2003-286550).

Applicants submit herewith “Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 That Inventors Named In This Application Conceived Or Invented The Subject Matter Which Is Disclosed In The Cited Publication.” As stated in the declaration, the cited disclosure in JP 2003-286550 was conceived or invented by the present inventors. Thus, Furuya et al. is not a 35 USC §102(a) prior art reference.

Therefore, the 35 USC §102(a) rejection has been overcome.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Furuya et al. (JP 2003-286550) and Saito et al., (*Microstructure and Magnetostriction of Rapid-Solidified Fe-15 at % Ga Alloy, Materials Transactions, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp.193-198*).

As mentioned, Applicants submit the “Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132.” As also stated in the declaration, the cited disclosure in Saito et al. was conceived or invented by the present inventors. Thus, Saito et al. is not a 35 USC §102(a) prior art reference, either.

Therefore, the 35 USC §102(a) rejection has also been overcome.

Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Furuya et al. (JP 2003-286550).

As discussed above, by the submission of the “Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132,” it has been shown that Furuya et al. is not a 35 USC §102(a) prior art reference.

Therefore, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection has also been overcome.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Furuya et al. (JP 2003-286550) in view of Clark et al. (US 2003/0010405).

As discussed above, by the submission of the “Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132,” it has been shown that Furuya et al. is not a 35 USC §102(a) prior art reference. Clark et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of Furuya et al.

Therefore, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection has also been overcome.

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Saito et al., (*Microstructure and Magnetostriction of Rapid-Solidified Fe-15 at % Ga Alloy*, Materials Transactions, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp.193-198).

As discussed above, by the submission of the “Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132,” it has been shown that Saito et al. is not a 35 USC §102(a) prior art reference.

Therefore, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection has also been overcome.

Application No.: 10/598,767

Response
Attorney Docket No.: 062888

In view of the aforementioned remarks, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Sadao Kinashi

Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 48,075
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

Attachment: Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 That Inventors Named In This Application Conceived Or Invented The Subject Matter Which Is Disclosed In The Cited Publication

SK/ttw

Q:\Attorney Files\Kinashi Sadao\2006\062888\062888 amd 1.doc